UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,883	12/13/2000	Jeffrey A. Dean	0026-0006	5681

44989 7590 03/20/2006

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER	
SAIN, GAUTAM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,883	DEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34 and 37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34 and 37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1) This is a Final rejection in response to the amendment and remarks filed on 1/3/06.

2) Claims 1-34 and 37 are pending and rejected in this action. Applicant canceled claims 35, 36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3-1) Claims 1, 2, 4- 6, 11, 13, 17, 18, 22, 24-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (US 6070158, filed Nov 1997), in view of NonPatent Literature "WebWatcher: A Learning Apprentice for the World Wide Web" (Robert Armstrong, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, issued Feb 1, 1995, pages 1-7)(hereinafter "WebWatcher").

Regarding Claim 1, Kirsch teaches identifying ... more entries (ie., the search engine identifies a predetermined document from the collection of documents)(col 3, line 66- col 4, line 5);

Determining ... document (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch teaches the amended limitation "based on a score of a document associated with the entry". For Example, Kirsch discloses a relevancy score for the predetermined document for the query (col 4, lines 1-5).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 2, Kirsch teaches web document (ie., web document)(col 1, line 45).

Regarding Claim 4, Kirsch teaches intercepting ... client (ie., Fig 1, item 16 shows the search the search site input data from the server 18 and outputs to client.

Regarding Claim 5, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries ... to the link (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page based on the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

Regarding Claim 6, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries ... identified document (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page based on the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link that refers to a further page as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 11, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57); Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);
Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

Regarding Claim 13, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57); Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);
Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

Regarding Claim 17, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches "visually distinguishing the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link)(page 3, upper left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired

information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 18, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches visually distinguishing ... determined scores (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link and highlighting the most promising links)(page 3, upper and lower left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 22, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches annotating the entries based on the scores (ie., highlighting the most promising links to the user and adding the eyes icon)(Fig 4, page 3, upper left corner).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 24, Kirsch teaches determining ... document (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches identifying a document based ... plurality of entries (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 25, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instructions (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

determining a score ofr each of the entries in the one or more documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches identify one or more documents that include a plurality of entries based on one or more addresses associated with the one or more documents (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the entries based on the determined score, provide the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 26, Kirsch teaches a browser (ie., web browser)(col 5, line 14);

a browser assistant configured to determine ... documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches request documents from ... plurality of entries (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the requested documents based on the determined scores and present the modified documents to facilitate selection of one or more of the entries (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired

information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 27, is rejected under a similar line of rejection as claim 26 since the claimed subject matter is equivalent to claim 26.

Regarding Claim 28, is rejected under the similar line of rejection as claim 1 since the claimed subject matter is equivalent to claim 1.

Regarding Claim 29, Kirsch teaches identifying the entries in the document (ie., search engine to identify a predetermined document)(col 3, line 65-col 4, line 5);

Sending the identified entries to a server (ie., the search service reference the document by a document server which sends the result to the Internet, presumable thru the internet server)(col 5, lines 15-23);

Receiving, from the server, scores for the identified entries (ie., the requesting client receives the results with scores via the internet and displays to the user)(see Fig 1, items 14, 16, 18; col 5, lines 15-23).

Regarding Claim 30, Kirsch teaches sending the document to a server (ie., with a distribute database server within the search site, the document server 18 gets the document, adds the highlights or other identifiers and sends the result to the client)(col 7, lines 30-35; col 5, lines 15-23).

Regarding Claim 31, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instructions (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

determine a score for each of the entries in the one or more documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches obtaining a request for a document that includes one or more entries, identify the documents based on one or more addresses associated with the documents (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the document based on the determined score, provide the modified document ... document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Regarding Claim 33, Kirsch teaches receiving a document [ ], the document including one or more entries (ie., the web search service allows content based search to be conducted against documents maintained at eh distributed search sites and in turn the sent to the document server)(col 5, lines 17-23).

Determining ... entries (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... sending the modified document to the second server (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to sugest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher bracketes the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

3-2) Claims 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Pant et al (US 6012053, filed Jun 23, 1997).

Regarding Claim 3, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach but Pant teaches non-web document (col 1, lines 32-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include non-web documents as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 12,14, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches for each of the linked documents, comparing the query with the contents of the linked document, and determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of match between the query and the contents of the linked document (ie., search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item)(col 1, lines 50-63; col 2, lines 25-43; col 3, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 15, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "reordering the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores)(col 2, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 16, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "sorting the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores) (col 2, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 20, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "moving one or more of the entries with a score above a threshold to a prominent locations in the identified document" (ie., user selects relevance factors and the presentation of results differs)(col 13, lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and

the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

Regarding Claim 23, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "adding at least one of scores, rating symbols, and document information to the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., percentage as score)(col 2, lines 35-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a percentage as score as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

3-3) Claims 7, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Page (US 6285999, filed Jan 9, 1998).

Regarding Claim 7, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches "for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that contain links to the linked documents," "determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents," "associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified documents" (col 3, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include provide for scoring linked database documents as taught by Page, providing the motivation to determine the importance of a document (Page, col 3, lines 20-25).

Regarding Claim 9, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches "determining a popularity of each of the linked documents," "determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the determined popularity," "associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified documents" (ie., importance of a document if highly cited by other documents... rank assigned to it ... providing a score linked database documents) (col 2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 5-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

Regarding Claim 10, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches "for each of the linked documents, determining a popularity of a web site containing the linked document," "associating the popularity of the web site to the linked document" (ie., importance of a document if highly cited by other documents... rank assigned to it ... providing a score linked database documents) (col 2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

3-4) Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Lazarus et al. (US Patent 6134532, filed Nov 1997).

Regarding Claim 8, Kirsch teaches "associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document" (col 2, lines 35-55).

Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Lazarus teaches "determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents" (Lazarus, col 26, line 38).

Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Lazarus teaches "determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rate" (Lazarus, col 26, lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining a clickthrough rate as taught in Lazaru, providing the benefit of selecting and presenting personally targeted entities such as advertising ,... based on observed user behavior (Lazarus, Abstract) for practical and financial reasons (col 1, lines 40-50).

3-5) Claim 19, 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Brown et al. (US Patent 6635838, filed Jul 30, 1999).

Regard to dependent claim 19, Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "changing at least one of a font, style, size, or color of the entries provided to the user" (ie., bolding, color, text size, font, italic, shading on text)(Brown, col 7, line 55 – col 8, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include alteration of text to highlight the query text/data as taught in Brown, providing the benefit for internet users to have a tool to enable them to make more informed decisions about which links to follow and improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-20).

Regard to dependent claim 21, Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "deleting one or more of the entries with scores below a predetermined threshold" (ie., if below threshold, not displaying one of the prefetched entries)(col 10, lines 25-60; fig 12, items 1205-1260).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include removing an entry from a final display or a prefetched list if the threshold is not met, as taught in Brown, providing the benefit of an internet tool to enable users to make more informed decision about which link to follow, and dramatically improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-18).

3-6) Claims 32, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above).

Regarding Claims 32, 34, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instruction (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

Kirsch does not teach a processor configured to execute ... the one second server, but does teach a document server attached to the multiple databases servers distributed within search site, and a skilled artisan would consider these distributed servers as equivalent to the second server as claimed (ie., to determined score for the entries from a predetermined document from a collection of documents)(col 4, lines 1-5; col 7, line 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include the distributed database servers working in conjunction with a document server to determine the score for providing search query results as suggested by Kirsch, providing the benefit of real-time document indexes that can be distributed over a number of collection index servers to service search queries from a client (col 3, lines 52-57).

3-7) Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballard (US 5987457, issued Nov 16, 1999) in view of Webwatcher (as cited above).

Regarding Claim 37, Ballard teaches receiving an input from a user. For example, user enters the initial query (col 2, line 34).

Ballard teaches determining a score for each of the links. For example, a query system that keeps a track of frequency of occurrence of each keyword in a document (col 2, line 56-57).

Ballard does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *requesting a document based on the input, the document including a plurality of links to other documents.* For example, In a learning apprentice for the world wide web, a plurality of links listed as sources(Fig 4 shows a web page with links listed).

Ballard does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches *a browser assistant to intercept the document, parse the document to identify the links in the document, modify the document based on the determined scores, present the modified document to the user.* For example, the Webwatcher identifies the link of choice prior to displaying to user and goes through the document to identify the link with a pair of eyes flanking the link for display to the user (see comparison of Fig 1 and Fig 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ballard to include identifying a link to display to the user by going through the document to identify the link and flank it a pair of eyes as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that once would not been motivated to combine the Kirsch

with the Armstrong reference (top page 16). Examiner disagrees because both references deal with a locating information on the world wide web. Applicant further argues that Kirsch and Armstrong do not teach determining a score for each of the entries in an identified document based on a score of a document associated with the entry. The examiner disagrees because Kirsch discloses a search engine includes an accumulator for summing a relevancy score for the predetermined document (Kirsch, col 4, lines 1-5). Applicant argues that Kirsch does not teach determining scores for linked document with corresponding entries in an identified preexisting document stored by a server in a network (page 17, mid). The examiner disagrees because Kirsch does teach on a network, documents are searched to yield a score of document relevancy with the search term (col 5, lines 40-45). Applicant argues for independent claim 27 (on page 19, middle) that Kirsch nor Armstrong discloses a web browser that modifies the document based on the entries. The Examiner disagrees, by comparing Fig 4 with Fig 1 or Armstrong, the pair of eyes modifies the document to indicate that a criteria is satisfied (see Armstrong, fig 1 and fig 4). Applicant argues (on page 20) that Kirsch nor Armstrong discloses the combination of features recited in claim 33. The Examiner disagrees, Fig 1 shows a number of disparate servers that are different than the document server. Applicant argues against the Lazarus reference (pages 23-25). The Examiner disagrees because Lazarus does disclose more relevant matches for user queries (as is the inventive subject matter of the instant application)(Lazarus, Title, Abstract section). For independent claims 32 and 34, Applicant argues that Kirsch does not disclose a processor to obtain, from one of second servers, one or more entries

from a document, determine scores for the one or more entries and return the scores to the one second server. The Examiner disagrees because Kirsch does teach a document server disparate from the search sites (which presumably have servers)(see Fig 1).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S 3/9/6

GS

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100